

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

The present amendment cancels claim 4, amends claims 1 and 5, and adds new claim 32.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate therein the aspect ratio limitation of now cancelled claim 4. Claim 5 has been amended to place this claim in a better condition for allowance. New claim 32 has been added to incorporate therein the limitations of claims 1 and 5, as previously presented.

Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 5, and new claim 32, is found at specification page 7, lines 23-31, page 9, lines 9-34, page 15, lines 1-13, and Figure 1, as well as original claims 4 and 5.

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-32 are currently pending in the present application. Claim 4 has been cancelled, claims 1 and 5 have been amended, and new claim 32 has been added, by the present amendment.

Applicants wish to extend their appreciation to Examiner Chau for withdrawing the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 (first and second paragraphs), 102(a) and 103(a).

The rejections of: (1) claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Barthlott (U.S. Patent 6,660,363); (2) claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated over Baumann (U.S. 6,800,354); (3) claims 3, 6, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Barthlott in view of Huffer (U.S. Patent 6,783,807); (4) claims 10 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Barthlott in view of Baumann; (5) claims 12, 14, 16-19, 25, 26, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Barthlott in view of Keller (U.S. 2002/0016433); (6) claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Barthlott in view of Keller and Baumann; (7) claims 20-24 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Barthlott in view of Keller and Huffer; (8) claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 21-25 and 31 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 and 8-16 of Nun '856 (U.S. Patent 6,811,856) alone or in view of Keller; and (9) claims 1-3, 6 and 10 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-16 of copending application 10/506,993 (Nun '326, U.S. 2005/0112326), are obviated by amendment, with respect to claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-32, which incorporates the aspect ratio limitation of now cancelled claim 4 into amended claim 1, and adds new claim 32 which incorporates therein the limitations of claims 1 and 5, as previously presented.

Amended claim 1 recites an injection molding with at least one surface which has self-cleaning properties, wherein the surface has securely anchored microparticles which form elevations having an aspect ratio of from 0.3 to 0.9.

New claim 32 recites an injection molding with at least one surface which has self-cleaning properties, wherein the surface has securely anchored microparticles which form elevations, and wherein the securely anchored microparticles are nanostructured microparticles with fine structure elevations having an aspect ratio of greater than 1.

As acknowledged in the Official Action, Barthlott, Baumann, Huffer, Keller, Nun '856 and Nun '326 fail to disclose or suggest the aspect ratio limitations of previously presented claims 4 and 5, which have been incorporated into amended claim 1 and new claim 32, respectively. As a result, Barthlott, Baumann, Huffer, Keller, Nun '856 and Nun '326 fail to render obvious to a skilled artisan the claimed injection molding of the present invention.

Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance and notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



David P. Stitzel  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 44,360

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)